DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument regarding "Hisatomi which does not teach at least including in a definition file, information on decomposition of document data into one or more compressed image files." has been fully considered, in response "Hisatomi discloses to include in the definition file information on the decomposition of the document data into the compressed image file (paragraphs [0080]-[0081], where the it is determined if the XML data for printing (decomposition information) has been received in the printer, thus a clear indication that data is included in the definition file as sent in step S1700 of Fig. 2)". Hisatomi encloses information about the decomposition of document data within the XML format, thus this limitation is met by the Hisatomi reference as evidenced in the above statement and the rejection below.

2. Objection to the specification has been withdrawn in view of the submitted amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-2, 11-14, 18 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857).

(1) regarding claims 1, 13, 25 and 26:

Hisatomi '857 discloses a data processing device (100 in Fig. 1), comprising

a transceiver (112 in Fig. 1, paragraph [0070], lines 1-3 and paragraph [0075], where the outer interface is performing the job of a transceiver); and

a processing unit (114 in Fig. 1, and paragraph [0054]) coupled to the transceiver (bus 116 in Fig. 1) configured to define at least one compressed image file in a definition file written in a markup language (paragraph [0040], lines 1-4, paragraph [0044], lines 6-9, paragraph [0049], where a file is being added to the definition file that is in a markup language), to print document data into the compressed image file (paragraph [paragraph [0048]-[0049], where a print document is being processed into a definition file), to include in the definition file information on the decomposition of the document data into the compressed image file (paragraphs [0080]-[0081], where the it is determined if the XML data for printing (decomposition information) has been received in the printer, thus a clear indication that data is included in the definition file as sent in step S1700 of Fig. 2), and to transfer the definition file and the compressed image file with the transceiver to a printer capable of interpreting the definition file and printing the compressed image file, whereby the document data is printed (paragraph [0064], where the files are been sent for printing along with print data information (definition file)).

(2) regarding claims 2 and 14:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to include in the definition file a reference to the compressed image file (paragraph

[0040], lines 1-12 and paragraph [0043], where the information about print data contains a reference to the print file).

(3) regarding claims 11 and 23:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to receive an image request from the printer via the transceiver (paragraph [0070], lines 1-3) and to transfer the compressed image file via the transceiver to the printer in response to the received image request (paragraph [0075]).

(4) regarding claims 12 and 24:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the image request for it has been received (Fig. 2, where the generation of the compress file S1600 is done after the request for it S1200).

(5) regarding claim 18:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses printing the document data into the compressed image file in two stages including the printing of the document data into a bit map file and converting the bit map file into the compressed image file (paragraph [0066]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 4, 9, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Henry et al. (US 6,538,766).

(1) regarding claims 4 and 16:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to paginate the document data, to split each page of the paginated document data into bands having a predetermined width and height, and to print each band into the compressed image file.

However, Henry '766 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to paginate the document data (page divider 2 in Fig.4), to split each page of the paginated document data into bands having a predetermined width and height (column 5, lines 27-30), and to print each band into the compressed image file (column 5, lines 49-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to paginate the document data, to split each page of the paginated document data into bands having a predetermined width and height, and to print each band into the compressed image file as taught by Henry '766 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the invention aims to provide a method and device or conversion into bit-map mode which allows processing by band, whilst minimizing the memory size necessary for storing the data in the course of processing (column 1, lines 39-42).

(2) regarding claims 9 and 21:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to divide the document data into compressed image files not exceeding a predetermined size limit.

However, Henry '766 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to divide the document data into compressed image files not exceeding a predetermined size limit (column 5, lines 17-23, where the predetermined size limit is one page).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to divide the document data into compressed image files not exceeding a predetermined size limit as taught by Henry '766 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the invention aims to provide a method and device or conversion into bit-map mode which allows processing by band, whilst minimizing the memory size necessary for storing the data in the course of processing (column 1, lines 39-42).

7. Claims 5-6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Nielsen (US 6,199,080).

(1) regarding claims 5 and 17:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in a what-you-see-is-what-you-get or WYSIWYG fashion.

However, Nielsen '080 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in a what-you-see-is-what-you-get or WYSIWYG fashion (column 3, lines 14-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in a what-you-see-is-what-you-get or WYSIWYG fashion as taught by Nielsen '080 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the user makes sure that the information he wants would be the information he gets, thus making the system user-friendlier.

(2) regarding claim 6:

Hisatomi '857 further discloses wherein the processing unit is further configured to print the document data into the compressed image file in two stages including the printing of the document data into a bit map file and converting the bit map file into the compressed image file (paragraph [0066]).

8. Claims 7-8 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Takayanagi (US 5,168,371).

(1) regarding claims 7 and 19:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete the definition file after it has been transferred to the printer.

However, Takayanagi '371 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete the definition file after it has been transferred to the printer (column 5, lines 60-68 and column 6, lines 1-9, where the parameters are been interpreted as part of a definition file).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete the definition file after it has been transferred to the printer as taught by Takayanagi '371 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, a picture image processing system that insures the security of picture image datafiles by prohibiting any unauthorized person from accessing stored picture image datafiles (column 1, lines 58-62).

(2) regarding claims 8 and 20:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete each compressed image file after it has been transferred to the printer.

However, Takayanagi '371 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete each compressed image file after it has been transferred to the printer (column 5, lines 60-68 and column 6, lines 1-9, where the picture image datafile are been interpreted as the compressed image file).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to delete each compressed image file after it has been transferred to the printer as taught by Takayanagi '371 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, a picture image processing system that insures the security of picture image datafiles by prohibiting any unauthorized person from accessing stored picture image datafiles (column 1, lines 58-62).

9. Claims 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatomi et al. (2002/0171857) in view of Dimperio et al. (US 5,142, 667).

(1) regarding claims 10 and 22:

Hisatomi '857 discloses all the subject matter as described above except wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the previous compressed image file has been transferred to the printer and deleted from the processing unit.

However, Dimperio '667 teaches wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the previous compressed image file has been transferred to the printer and deleted from the processing unit (column 13, lines 57-68, where the image files are been deleted after been processed and printed and them a new compressed file can be generated).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a the time the invention was made wherein the processing unit is further configured to generate the compressed image file after the previous compressed image file has been transferred to the printer and deleted from the processing unit as taught by Dimperio '667 in the system of Hisatomi '857. With this, the system would save memory space, thus saving computer resources necessaries or that may be needed for other processes.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LENNIN R. RODRIGUEZ whose telephone number is (571)270-1678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30am - 6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571) 272-7440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lennin R Rodriguez/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625